



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

normal or abnormal, modified at the point like the Lil-Lil and hook boomerang; and the slashing type modified at the grip—the knob boomerang and wooden sword.

The plates showing the progressive variations of the types are very interesting, the descriptions are clear and full, and the presentation and discussion of the decoration of the specimens is a valuable contribution.

WALTER HOUGH.

El Hueso Parietal bajo la influencia de la deformación fronto-occipital; contribución al estudio somático de los antiguos Calchaquíes. (The Parietal Bone under the influence of the fronto-occipital deformation; contribution to the somatological study of the ancient Calchaqui). By J. A. DILLENIUS. Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, Publicaciones de la Sección Antropológica, No. 7. Buenos Aires, 1910. 11 × 7½, pp. 96, 14 plates, 21 text figures.

When I read for the first time in the *Sumarios de las Conferencias y Memorias presentadas al XVII Congreso internacional de las Americanistas* (Resúmen No. 1, *La verdadera forma del craneo calchaqui deformado*) that Miss Juliane A. Dillenius, a pupil of Professor Lehmann-Nitsche, had come to the conclusion that the true, original headform of the Calchaqui must have been dolichocephalic, I was very much astonished. But I was not the only one, as I learned afterwards. Miss Dillenius' remarkable statement was a surprise indeed to several members of the Congress. Professor Ed. Seler, in his brief report on the Congress—which, by the way, contains several inaccuracies—speaks even of “ein gewisses Aufsehen” (*Zeitschr. f. Ethnologie*, 43, Jahrg., 1911, p. 118). Still, the history of science teaches us that many extraordinary, startling assertions, which at first nobody could believe, proved ultimately true. And so I waited to form a definite opinion on the subject until I should have read Miss Dillenius' final memoir. This I have done, but I would not undertake to write a review of it, if one of the editors of the *American Anthropologist* had not requested me, for criticising is often, in some respects, an ungrateful task indeed.

An elaborate study, of 96 large octavo pages, like *El Hueso Parietal* does not lend itself to a minute analysis in a brief space. Besides fourteen excellent plates, representing Calchaqui skulls, this memoir contains thousands of craniometrical cyphers, arranged on numerous tables, various diagrams, and other interesting figures. All these can not, of course, be commented on separately in this review. Let it suffice to give a general idea of the purport of Miss Dillenius' work.

It is difficult to imagine what originally can have induced Miss

Dillenius to undertake this extraordinary investigation. No physical anthropologist, I think, would ever have supposed that the artificially deformed, hyper- and ultra-brachycephalic Calchaqui were primitively dolichocephalic, unless influenced by some preconceived idea. The work of Father Damasus Aigner (*Ueber die Ossa parietalia des Menschen*, Munich, 1900) must have inspired Miss Dillenius, for under its influence her work was done. At any rate, she followed Aigner's method. Aigner invented a system of measurements to find out the difference which exists between the parietal bone of men and the anthropoids, as well as the difference between the parietal bone of dolichocephalic and brachycephalic skulls. This method enables one to know "with exactness all the existing ratios between the different elements of the parietal bone" (Dillenius, op. cit., p. ii). It consists of linear measurements and various angular measurements, which latter are partly taken with a little instrument (op. cit., p. 40, pl. VIII).

One hundred adult Calchaqui skulls were taken for examination from a series of 250, collected at Poma, Fuerte Alto, and La Paya, in the ancient Calchaqui country. Among these 250, only 3 skulls are undeformed. The series studied is on the whole ultra-brachycephalic, oscillating between 92 and 115.6. All these skulls belong to the Museum of the Faculty of Philosophy and Letters in Buenos Aires, of which Professor Ambrosetti is the director.

In Miss Dillenius' opinion all, or nearly all, the various deformations which she, and I myself, found on Calchaqui skulls, are subforms of the fronto-occipital deformation (p. 7), but she brings no proof whatever for this assertion. Her "*à nuestro juicio*" is not sufficient to convince one.

The people, or group of tribes, which we are used to call Calchaqui, or better Diaguitas; as Boman suggested, were, somatologically speaking, decidedly a very mixed lot. Virchow and those few, including myself, who have studied their osseous remains, have found several types among them, not only deformed, but normal. The latter and the but slightly, accidentally deformed skulls in the La Plata Museum formed about 40 per cent of the collection I studied there in 1896. Among these 40 per cent I distinguished not less than six types, but *only one* was a true dolichocephal (index 72.4), two were mesati- or mesocephalic, while all the others were brachycephalic in different degrees. And amongst all these non-deformed skulls *there was not a single one which could be classed as Palaeo-American*, in the sense employed by Miss Dillenius.¹ Dr Rivet has shown in his valuable memoir

¹After *her own* terminology, as Lehmann-Nitsche writes me, "*ohne dass hier an Deniker gedacht worden wäre.*" This makes the question still more confused.

on the Lagoa Santa-race in Ecuador (*Bull. et Mém. Soc. d'Anthr. Paris*, V^e série, t. IX, pp. 251, 252) that the Calchaqui skull to which I at first attributed somewhat Palaeo-American characteristics, belongs to a different type. The same applies to a certain Araucanian skull, with which I compared it. Virchow, who described also a dolichocephalic skull from Tinogasta, said that this skull could never have belonged to the same race as the hypsi-brachycephalics of Barranca (Cf. my *Anthropologie des anciens habitants de la région Calchaquie*, pp. 32, 39, 59). Miss Dillenius does not say explicitly to which type the three skulls of her series, which had to be left out ("que debieron quedar fuera de concurso"), belong, but as two of them presented a slight flattening at the lambda, and it could not be made out whether the third was deformed or normal (p. 8), we may conclude that these three skulls were by no means typical Palaeo-Americans. It is obvious then that when we do not find any hypsi-dolichocephalic skulls among the non-deformed Calchaqui, the allegation of Miss Dillenius that the Calchaqui Indians were originally of the Palaeo-American type is valueless. Moreover, as long as we do not know in how far the other bones of the skull, besides the *os parietale*, are affected by artificial deformation, an absolute proof of what Miss Dillenius holds to be true can not be given. All the direct measurements and angles of this one bone after Father Aigner's method, however accurate it may be in itself, can not dispel my doubts. And finally, if Miss Dillenius had made a comparative study of the other skeletal remains (long bones, pelvis, etc.) also, and had found her hypothesis about the primitive skull-form confirmed, this would have lent a greater degree of probability to it. The "pues" and "irrecusablemente" with which Miss Dillenius emphasizes her final conclusion (pp. 87-89) are as little convincing as the preceding chapters.

Regardless of the main purport of Miss Dillenius' work the chapter on the configuration of the *lineae temporales* and the coronal suture at the *stephanion* (pp. 71-81) is very interesting and, in my opinion, the most valuable part of the whole memoir. Miss Dillenius has proved and demonstrated by several figures that the said region of the deformed skulls shows a peculiar anatomical characteristic which until now was found only among apes. It is due, she holds, to the artificial head deformation and she calls it, as suggested by Lehmann-Nitsche, a *pseudo-pithecoïd* characteristic. It is not congenital, but acquired, and belongs to "a primitive condition of man, in the sense of his ontogenetic evolution, and is a typical characteristic of the anthropoid apes."

The time and labor bestowed on *El Hueso Parietal* must have

been considerable. It is therefore the more to be regretted Miss Dillenius did not choose another subject of investigation on which she could have proven her patience and skill. American physical anthropology abounds in interesting problems, the solution of which would have benefited science much more than the seeking for a chimerical "true" primitive headform. In this connection I would quote the opinion of Virchow: "Die Ermittlung der natürlichen Schädelform der Eingeborenen ist in keinem Welttheil mit so grossen Schwierigkeiten verknüpft, als in Amerika" (*Crania Americana*, p. 5). Thus the ground Miss Dillenius chose, or was suggested to tread on, is a slippery one indeed, with very few landmarks. Where many an old traveler in the fields of anthropology might have stumbled or lost his way, we can hardly blame a newcomer with but little experience if a similar fate befalls him.

H. TEN KATE.

Cat's Cradles from Many Lands. By KATHLEEN HADDON. London & New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1911. $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$, pp. xvi, 95; 59 ills.

Miss Haddon has been introduced into the subject of the forms of play of primitive people under the eminent guidance of her father. She gives us in the present volume a useful collection of string figures, collected from a variety of sources. She applies the common terminology devised by Dr Haddon. Her book and that of Mr Jayne are valuable sources for a form of play that has attracted the attention of students, and is perhaps better known than any other games of primitive people.

FRANZ BOAS.